

1 WO

KM

2

3

4

5

6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

8

9

Laura L. Medley,) No. CV 08-590-PHX-MHM (DKD)
10 Plaintiff,) **ORDER**
11 vs.)
12 Timothy Overton,)
13 Defendant.)

14

15 Plaintiff Laura L. Medley, who is confined in the Maricopa County Lower Buckeye
16 Jail, filed a *pro se* civil rights Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On May 8, 2008, the
17 Court dismissed the Complaint for failure to state a claim. Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal
18 on May 14, 2008 (Doc. #8).19 On June 2, 2008, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Copy of Entire Docket (Doc. #12). The
20 Court will grant the Motion to the extent that the Court will provide Plaintiff with a copy of
21 the Court's electronic docket.22 To the extent that Plaintiff is seeking copies of every document filed in this case, the
23 Court will deny the Motion. The Clerk of Court charges 50 cents per page for reproducing
24 any record or paper. See Judicial Conference Schedule of Fees ¶ 4, foll. 28 U.S.C. § 1914.
25 An inmate has no right to free copies of pleadings. See In Re Richard, 914 F.2d 1526, 127
26 (6th Cir. 1990) (*per curiam*) (28 U.S.C. § 1915 “does not give a litigant a right to have
27 documents copied and returned to him at government expense”). Further, the Ninth Circuit
28 has rejected any constitutional right to unlimited free photocopying. See Johnson v. Moore,

1 936 F.2d 921, 923 (9th Cir. 1991) (*per curiam*), superceded on other grounds, 948 F.2d 517
2 (9th Cir. 1991) (*per curiam*); and Sands v. Lewis, 886 F.2d 1166, 1169 (9th Cir. 1989)
3 (rejecting any constitutional right to free and unlimited photocopying) (citing Jones v.
4 Franzen, 697 F.2d 801, 803 (7th Cir. 1983) (“[B]road as the constitutional concept of liberty
5 is, it does not include the right to xerox.”)). Accordingly, the Clerk of Court will provide
6 Plaintiff with copies of documents filed in this case only upon receipt of a written request
7 accompanied by payment of the 50 cents per page copy fee.

8 **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s June 2, 2008 Motion for Copy of Entire Docket
9 (Doc. #12) is **granted** to the extent that the Clerk of Court must provide Plaintiff with a copy
10 of the Court’s electronic docket. Plaintiff’s Motion is **denied** with respect to all other relief
11 requested.

12 DATED this 19th day of June, 2008.

13
14
15 Mary H. Murguia
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28